ADDRESS ON PUBLIC ISSUES

AND -

RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT



DELIVERED BY

HON. J. R. STRATTON, M.P.

MONDAY, JULY 3rd, 1911





ADDRESS

DELIVERED BY

HON. J. R. STRATTON, M.P.

MONDAY, JULY 3rd, 1911

Hon. Mr. Stratton addressed a meeting of his constituents in the Orange Hall, Hall's Bridge, Buckhorn. on Monday evening.

In spite of the intense heat there

was a good attendance.

The chair was occupied by Mr. Andrew Shearer. Mr. Stratton received a hearty reception, and his address. which necessarily occupied some time, was attentively and appreciatively listened to.

The chairman, in his preliminary remarks, stated that Mr. Stratton was to address the meeting on public questions, at any time a matter of great interest, but at the present time of special interest. He pointed out that Mr. Stratton, when he had been a representative in the Local House, had followed the custom of meeting the people frequently, to place before them the doings of the people's representative. He was glad he was present again for a similar purpose; and he kept himself so closely in touch with all parts of his Riding that he required no further introduction.

Mr. Stratton said:

Gentlemen-I am very glad to again so many of my friends in the good old townships of Smith and Harvey. I was a member of the Provincial Legislature, you will remember that at the close of every session I appeared before the electors to give an account of my stewardship and to review the legislation, and give a synopsis of the work of the Session. Since you have honoured me with the responsibility of a seat in Parliament, I have not been able, for certain reasons, to carry out this practice as fully as I desired to do. You will remember that after the first Session, I was

prevented by the trial of the protest that was entered against my return, on the grounds that my election was secured by corrupt practices. You all know the result of the trial of that protest. You will recall that the only corrupt practice revealed was shown to have been employed by my opponenta in the form of bribery to secure evidence of corrupt practices on my part and by means that brought the perpetrators perilously close to the pen-alties of the criminal code. After the second Session I had the pleasure of addressing a few meetings of my coustituents.

I appear before you now, not that the third Session is ended, but there has been an adjournment under peculiar circumstances. His Majesty's loyal Conservative Opposition have seen fit to pursue a policy of obstruction and the adjournment till July 18th, is the indirect, if not direct, outcome, of this obstruction of the country's business.

Promoting Constituency Interests.

But before entering upon a consideration of this, and before entering upon a reference to the important questions that have engaged the attention of the House this Session, I may deal with the more intimate relations as between myself and my constituents, whose servant I am. I may say that since representing you in Parliament I have endeavoured to protect your interests and promote your welfare. The public money of Canada is for public purposes. It is the money of the people and the people have a right to share in the benefits of its expenditure for legitimate purposes - its expenditure, in providing the conveniences and improvements that it is the duty of the Government to provide. In

this regard, I may say without vanity or boasting, that I have tried not to permit the Government to forget their duty to the people of West Peterbor-Whatever improvements the ough. Government have made in this Riding, they deserve credit for. But all Governments are not inclined to be too liberal in regard to improvements of a local character, whose importance and advantage they do not know as well as those directly concerned. In great schemes of transportation such as national canals and railways, the Government is in a position to take the initiative, yet these have, nevertheless, to be urged by deputations. But in regard to local needs of a similar character, they have to be shown; the claims of constituents have to be urged upon them. And I can assure you that with the multiplicity of demands pouring in upon a Government from over two hundred constituencies, it takes, on the part of a member, a little persistence and fidelity to the interests of his constituents to convince them. To show that I have not been entirely idle as your representative-that I have not forgotten your claims, it is only fair to myself, as due to yourselves, that I should briefly present a list of the Government improvements that have been made in this Riding since I had the honour of representing it. These conveniences and improvements are so evidently in the public interest, that this need not be insisted upon. They give the people opportunity to reap the fullest advantage of the splendid facilities presented by the Trent Canal and our lakes and rivers. The money of the people has been expended to good advantage in their interests, and it is gratifying to me that I have been able to be of some use to my constituents.

The following list of these improvements may be of some interest, to the people, and serve to remind them that the West Riding of Peterborough has not been altogether neglected. I shall not undertake to mention the improvements made and the facilities provided in the order of their construction, nor the further work in progress, and to be undertaken, but give them as they occur to me.

Wolfe Street Wharf.

The Wolfe street wharf, in the City of Peterborough, since its construction has been extended, completed and covered, at a cost representing

about \$10,000, and the east side of the river has been dredged and improved with a view of conserving the water flow, and facilitating the passage of logs by a chute provided for that purpose, without undue waste of water.

Post Office Improvements.

Peterborough has, as we all are pleased to know, outgrown the present Post Office accommodation, rendering extensive additions necessary to meet the requirements of the public. An initial appropriation of \$10,-000 has been made for this purpose, and it will probably require an additional \$5,000 to complete the work now in progress. When this \$15,000 is expended, it is expected that Peterborough will have adequate post office accommodation for some time to come-it is to be hoped, for only a short time. We all should like the city to improve in population so rapidly as to soon require additional post office accommodation

Complete New Wharfage Works.

The growing commercial importance of the city has also made the present wharfage inadequate - not only for present and immediately prospective requirements of navigation and passenger and goods traffic, not to speak of the requirements that will follow the completion of the Trent Canal to Lake Ontario, and later when it is open for navigation its entire length. To meet present, and anticipate, future needs an appropriation of \$20. 000 was procured during the Session of 1910-11, for a new and commodious wharf which, when completed, will be worthy of the City of Peterborough and the navigation interests, it is intended to serve. It is proposed to procure by purchase, or expropriation, the lake front property of Mr. G. W. Hatton, lying between the premises of the Matthews Company and those of the Point St. Charles saw mills. Upon this site an extensive system of wharfage will be constructed of an area and character, that the situation and its future use will, respectively, permit and demand. And when the work is completed, at a cost, which will necessarily be in considerable excess of the original appropriation of \$20,000, Peterborough will, as its commercial importance deserves, possess, undoubtedly, the best wharfage upon the line of the whole canal.

Mark Street Wharf, East City.

One of the best wharves now on the canal is the fine new wharf that has been constructed on East City side of the lake, at the foot of Mark street. This wharf has an area of 50 x 130 feet, is filled with stone and gravel, will afford an excellent and adequate accommodation for the eastern section of the city, and is in all ways excellent value for the \$5,000 expended upon its construction.

Electric Lighting of Lift-Lock.

A very interesting feature of the improvements made upon the canal is the lighting by electricity of the Lift-Lock and other important points on the canal. This work is now under way, and when completed, will confer additional interest upon one of the unique features of canal equip-ment, and the largest and completest of its kind in the world. Its lighting will be an additional attraction to the visitors to the Lift-Lock from all parts of the world, and its practical value will consist in permitting the lock to be used at night, to the great convenience of steamer navigation. In addition, new houses, of a character becoming to the situation, are in course of erection at present at the Lift-Lock, the night operation of the Lift-Lock making it necessary that the lock masters and their assistants should reside conveniently to it.

Improving River Navigation.

In further improvement of the river in this vicinity, an appropriation has been obtained for the additional dredging of the river below Peterborough, and an additional sum of \$3,000 for dredging the river between Peterborough and Lakefield. This is in addition to recent dredging which has resulted in the great improvement of the navigation channel.

Pengelly's Wharf.

The wharf, built at Pengelly's Landing, Rice Lake, is, and will continue to be, a great convenience to a large number of farmers in the vicinity in the way of boarding or leaving steamers and shipping produce and receiving goods that may be brought by steamer down the river. The wharf, with an area of nearly 800 square feet and a 70 foot approach, involved the expenditure of \$5,000.

Wharf at Hail's Landing.

At Hall's Landing a few miles east of Pengelly's, a new wharf has been built. With a width of thirty feet, it extends about 60 feet from the shore, furnishing excellent and convenient accommodation for the loading of live stock, grain, etc., etc.

Campbelltown.

A new wharf at Campbelltown, 8 feet by 60 feet, with an approach of 20 feet by 60 feet, has been constructed, at a cost of over \$2,000.

Smithson's Landing.

At Smithson's Landing on the Otonabee side, the wharf built some time ago, has been enlarged and improved. It is now 30 feet in length, filled with stone and gravel; this wharf affords excellent accommodation to the farmers of South Monaghan in this vicinity.

Wharf at Whitfield's.

At Whitfield's Landing, on the Otonabee, an excellent new wharf has been built the past winter, to serve the convenience of the neighbouring farmers as well as of the public. To a considerable number of persons who will be benefitted by this wharf, when the concession line is opened, it will be of advantage, and it is to the boat owners a "want supplied," as throughout the season many stops will be made at this place. It is filled with stone and gravel and has an area of 25 feet by 60.

Improvements at Lakefield.

Lakefield has had its importance as the point of departure and arrival of Stoney Lake travel and traffic recognized by the provision of a system of wharfage, of which the village and those responsible for its construction, may reasonably feel proud. During the recent past, great improvements have been made. The wharfage now consists of between five and six hundred feet of splendid concrete wharf-involving with the neat pavilion, for the ac-commodation of the travelling public, an expenditure of \$10,000. The extension of the wharf, so as to permit the debarkation of passengers directly from the Grand Trunk trains to Trunk trains to steamers and vice versa, represents a convenience that will be greatly appreciated by the large and increasing number of citizens and tourists, that frequent the Stoney Lake waters.

Lumber and Cement.

A new wharf has been constructed on the river at Lakefield, available for use for the shipment of cement and lumber, with provision for railway connection, when the completion of the canal, or development of traffic, will render this necessary.

Young's Point Improvement.

Young's Point, within the past two or three years, has been greatly improved. The grounds, as becomes the half-way house to the lakes, have been considerably beautified, not the least among the items contributory to this result, being the excellent system of electric lighting that has been installed, and has already proved a great benefit to navigation interests. The work of improvement is still going on, and this year, two entrance piers to the locks will be placed on the east side.

Betterments at Juniper.

Juniper Island can now boast of wharfage accommodation and other facilities not easily surpassed by any other summer resort. The new wharf erected a year ago has been further extended. There is now adequate accommodation for steamers, gasoline launches and canoes, and the excellent new pavilion erected, serves to add completeness to the requirements of the island and the lake.

Mount Julian Wharfage.

A parliamentary appropriation was procured the first part of the present session, for the construction of additional and improved wharfage at Mount Julian. The wharf will be built at the lake end of the concession line, to the facilitation of the landing and embarkation of passengers at this point.

Chemong Wharf.

A substantial wharf has been constructed at Chemong at a cost of \$1,-000.

Braden's Landing.

An appropriation is available for the construction of a wharf at Braden's Landing to meet the wishes and serve the convenience of the residents in the vicinity of the landing in the Township of Smith, on the shores of

Chemong Lake, and the work will be proceeded with at an early date.

Nogie's Creek.

A wharf has been completed at Nosie's Creek at a cost of about \$500.00. The fine new dam on Nogie's Creek will serve a double purpose, conserve the water and promote the use of the stream for navigation purposes.

Other Improvements.

An excellent dam has been erected at Swamp Lake, and Union Creek has been cleared of obstructions at considerable cost. This will not only facilitate the passage of water in the spring and tend to prevent the danger of overflow of adjacent lands, but improve the stream for the passage of the products of lumbering operations.

Gannon's Narrows.

An expenditure of \$1100 has provided a new wharf at Gannon's Narrows.

Buckhorn Bridge and Dam.

One of the most important improvements on the canal system has been effected at Buckhorn. The expenditure of \$75,000 is represented by a splendid new dam and bridge combined. The bridge was erected on top of the dam -concurrently with the latter, for the accommodation of vehicular traffic. In consideration of the bridge being thus placed and made available for public use, the County agreed to contribute \$3,000, thus saving many times that amount, which a separate and independent bridge of equal stability and serviceability would have cost. I ters that, in the interests of the County, this sum of \$3,000 might be remitted; and I was fortunate enough to so represent the matter to the Government in such a light that an arrangement mutually satisfactory to the Government and the County Council was effected, by which the County was relieved of the payment of the \$3,000. The County, I think, may consider itself fortunate in securing a bridge by the simple way of utilizing the top of the dam for that purpose. In addition, at this point a new apparatus for operating the locks has been installed, at a cost of \$2,500, and a substantial and handsome residence for the lock master has been erected. This year, an appropriation of \$4,000 will be expended in the construction entrance piers to the of three new

lock. Two of these will be above the lock and one below.

New Dam, Burleigh Falls.

An important work is in progress and in contemplation, in the construction of a new dam at Burleigh Falls. and an expenditure of about \$80,000 is in progress. This is a beginning of a large enterprise that will tend to improve navigation, and increase the power development capacity of the dam. The raising of the water will enable Lovesick lock to be ultimately dispensed with ,thus removing the lock, which at present is a necessary impediment to navigation. The total expenditure upon this work will involve a cost of about \$300,000.

Works at Bobcaygeon.

In the interests of the water supply of the lake and canal below Bobcaygeon, in which that place is an important factor, the sum of \$15,000, voted for the purpose, will be expended in improvements at this point. The. locks will be repaired and made water. Join of the work of creating upplies of locks will be abole ours to store additional supplies of ished and the general condition and appearance of the place greatly improved.

CONSERVATION OF WATER.

It goes without saying, that the improvements and conveniences mentioned, in whose provision I had a humble share, important and valuable as they are to the interests they are intended to serve, would not be availabie without an adequate supply of water for navigation and, incidentally. power purposes.

Benefits of Conservation.

I can look with some satisfaction upon something I was fortunate enough in procuring when I had the honour to be Provincial Secretary in the Ontario Government. The transfer of the waters tributary to the Trent Valley System, from the Provincia, to the Dominion Government, rendered possible the construction of system of conservation dams in the north country, thus creating reservoirs, by means of which the flow of the water can be regulated and its volume controlled and conserve. We see the value of this, by contrasting the position of other places with that of Peterborough. Two winters ago, Uttawa, through its water being allowed to run away wastefully in spring freshets, and at other times, without proper control, had a water famine which paralyzed its mills and other industries dependent upon water power; and last winter the low water contributed to the creation of an epidemie of typhoid, numbering more than a thousand cases. In contrast, Peterborough, thanks to conservation of her waters, had at the same time an adequate supply of water for power and other purposes; not a wheel was idle, not a moment lost from failure in the water supply. During the past few years the flow of the Otonabee has been practically doubled and rendered uniform and constant, to the great advantage of the industrial establishments operated by, or supplying, electrical energy.

Expenditure Justifiable.

The money, a considerable sum, necessarily expended to secure these results, has been money well spent, as will be that to be spent in continuawater, and to bring into the water conservation system more of the water of the almost countless lakes that lie in the watershed of the Trent. We hear a good deal sometimes, from the op-ponents of the Government in the way of complaint of the "wasteful" expenditure of public money in the building of wharves and similar improvements in small praces, and to These facilities serve small needs. have been provided throughout the country in much the came way as the facilities I have just mentioned. I do not think that any benefitted by these minor works in Peterborough County and vicinity will say that any money has been wasted in providing the smallest of these conveniences. It of view that th from that point charge of waste of money on smaller nublic works in all parts is to be judged.

In the Interests of the People.

As I have mentioned, the monspent is the people's money, and is but common justice that the people should have the advantages this money spent by the Government, in the way I have just referred to, will, and does, provide.

A small wharf that will accommodate the farmers of a neighbourhood is, as far as their interests are concerned, as important to them as large and costly wharves in Montreal or Toronto are to the commercial and trading interests of these two places.

If the representatives of the people use their influence and efforts to procure the conveniences the people desire, that is what they are sent to Parliament for—to represent the people, to do their business and to see that all sections of the part of the country they represent, even the humblest, receive as far as practicable, the benefits of the expenditure of a due share of the public funds, contributed by the people of Canada, who en masse pay every cent of the immense national revenue—last year 117 1-2 millions.

Rural Mail Delivery.

Another of the conveniences that I consider the due of the people of West Peterborough is free rural mail delivery, and I am glad to say that I was able to impress my views upon the Post Office Department, with some effect. Rural free delivery, the policy of the Government, is arranged to be given as fully and as rapidly as possible, without bearing too heavily upon the revenue of the postal depart-In a thinly settled country like Canada, there are only certain densely populated districts, more where rural mail delivery is practiand these are the districts where rural mail delivery can be conjoined with daily mail carrying routes.

In West Peterborough there have been established several rural mail delivery routes, that will give daily delivery of mail matter, at the doors of those farmers living convenient to the route, who set up the necessary boxes. The several routes need only to be mentioned to show those acquainted with the geography of the county to what extent the districts are served. There have been established routes as follows:

From Peterborough to Fowler Corners and return.

About half of North Monaghan has been covered.

There is a route, one of the first opened, from Peterborough to Ennismore and return.

Another route extends northward from Lakefield to Lakehurst, and return.

And in the Township of Smith, in the Eastern part of the Township south of the Ninth Concession. there have been established router covering twenty-seven miles.

These routes will give those along them, even at many points distant from railways, the advantages in reregard to the receipt of mail matter. not enjoyed by cities and towns. which have not free postal delivery.

The Session.

As to the work of the Session, it is rather an uncertain matter to deal with—it is not the past session, for the Session is not over; it is not the present Session for there is an adjournment to July 18th. It may be remembered that the general feature of the Session, was the development on the part of the Conservative Opposition of a policy of obstruction. with the evident view of forcing a dissolution and a general election, on the reciprocity issue. The Opposition may justify to themselves this policy, but it would, in large part. defeat the object for which they claim an expression of opinion on reciprocity by the people.

This expression of popular opinion, taken before the distribution of seats, that follows every decennial census, would not be fair, because it would not give full expression of popular will. The great increase of population in the West will give that part of the Dominion from ten to fifteen new seats in the next Parliament elected after the census. To this extent an election held on the old lists will disfranchise a large portion of the West, and deprive it of a voice in the next Parliament.

Unfair and Unmanly.

This policy has two grave faults: it is unfair and unmanly; it is, in sporting language, a blow below the belt. And it is very like cowardice on the part of a great party, that dares not trust its cause to a full vote of the electors. The Opposition demands an appeal to the people on the reciprocity issue. The Northwest is known to be overwhelmingly in favour of an enlarged market: and, according to the Conservative policy, a large section of the very people who have the greatest interest in the question are to be throttled, and their voice unheard.

Forcing an Election.

It may be asked how a party in a minority, with about fifty fewer members in the House, can force an election. In Parliamentary language. "supply" is the money voted by Parliament for carrying on the business of the country. When the House is in committee of supply or committee of the Whole, there is no limit to the amount of talking and time wasting.

that may be practised.

So that half a dozen determined members may indefinitely stave off a vote of the necessary money to carry on public business in defiance, if need be, of the will of the other two hundred and ten members of the House. Thus business would be im-possible; there would be no money to carry on the public service, and dissolution would follow, and the country would be prematurely. thrown into the turmoil of a general election. The present Parliament was elected in November, 1908, and in the regular order of things there would be no general election till 1913.

No Mandate Argument.

One of the objections of the obstructionists is that Parliament has "no mandate" from the people to

adopt reciprocity.

The Conservative party in 1880. passed the Canadian Pacific bargain without consulting the people. This bargain, after only six weeks' discussion, was passed, by which Canada gave a grant of 25 million dollars—three millions more than the total revenue of that year, 23 million—and 25 million acres of land, and completed railway to the value of 28 millions. This legislation, impossing burdens at the second control of the s ing burdens on the people of a very grave character, in view of its wealth. at the time, was passed without an appeal to the people. Remember, I do not condemn the building of the C. P. R. It has been a great factor in national development. Parliament was within its powers in making the bargain; it had the right to do it; it was elected to do the business of the country.

Parliament Responsible.

The proper body to pass the C. P. R. bargain was Parliament, elected by and representing the people. The proper body to deal with the reciprocity agreement is Parliament.

elected by and representing the people, to do their business for five years, which, has two years to run. If there was no need—and there was none, and there was no reference,to refer to the people the C. P. R. bargain, that imposed a heavy bur-den of taxation on the people, then there is no need to refer to the people a trade agreement, which does not give away the lands or money of the people, nor impose any taxation: but gives them new markets, removes restriction of trade, and allows them to buy and sell food where they choose. The reciprocity agreement was before Parliament as many months as the C. P. R. agreement was weeks, almost, before Parliament and mills he before Parliament. ment, and will be before them again. Yet we must have Parliament ignore its duty and shift upon the people the work of deciding up-

Reciprocity the Liberal Policy.

If Mr. Borden and his parliamentary followers, or a few of them. have decided upon a policy of obstruction, carried to the point of forcing dissolution and an election they may, to that extent, succeed. But no threats of obstructive tactics will influence the Government to recede from the position it has taken upon the reciprocity agreement. Government negotiated it in the public interests, in the interests of the whole country generally, and the most important element of the people—the farming community. The ple—the farming community. The Government firmly believes that enlarged and unfettered opportunities of trade, of access to our nearest market, will be for the benefit of the agricultural industry and through its increased prosperity, to the country at large. If the Opposition, by obstruction, prevent the bringing of the agreement to a vote; if they block supply and force dissolution, they may prevent the adoption of the agreement by this Parliament. But it will be adopted by the Parliament that will be forced upon the country through a premature general election. Of this election the Liberal Government will not be afraid. Reciprocity is a popular slogan to appeal to a country whose prime interest is overwhelmingly agricultur-

Progress Under Liberal Rule. The Liberal Government is a Government of progress, and the progress of Canada has been in keeping with this character. When we wish to correctly appraise the standing and condition of a country, we look to the record of its trade and its revenue, the reflection, respectively, of enterprise and prosperity, and comparison with Conservative administrative results will, in these regards emphasize the successful character of Liberal administration.

Nothing to Gain.

And by this standard of judgment and record of results, the country will see that it has nothing to gain. but much to lose by substituting a live Government, animated by the spirit of progress, and with a splendid record to its credit, for a Government by a party with, to speak moderately, opposite, as well as opposition characteristics — especially the present Opposition, with no higher ideal than attainment of office by means of a negative policy. The Liberal Government has been in power fourteen years, and a fair comparison will be made by using 14-year periods.

In 1883, under Conservative rule. the total trade of Canada, imports and exports, was \$230,339,826.

After fourteen years of administration, in 1896, when the Conservatives retired from office, Canada's total trade was \$239,025,360, or a gain of nine millions, in fourteen years—or at the rate of \$643,000 a year.

When the Liberal Government took power fourteen years ago the total trade of Canada was (in 1897) \$239,244,274. Fourteen years later, in 1911. Canada's total trade was \$759,094,389. or an increase of \$509,849,916, in fourteen years—or at the rate of \$3,641,785 per year.

Liberal Growth of Trade.

The increase of trade in the four-teen-year Liberal period was over five and a half times greater than in the Conservative period. During the period of Liberal rule, Canada's trade with Great Britain increased, in round numbers, from 98 millions to 234 millions. In the corresponding period, under Conservative rule, the trade of Canada increased from 91 millions to 95 millions, a difference of increase in favour of Liberal rule of 230 millions. Under Conservative rule Canada's trade with the United States fell from 94 millions

to 91 millions, in fourteen years. Under Liberal rule, Canada's trade with the United States in fourteen years increased from 100 millions to 321 millions.

If, in the face or a hostile tariff the trade of Canada with the United States increased three-fold under Liberal administration, what will that trade become under a reciprocal arrangement that makes the bulk of our exports—agricultural products—free? These few figures show that during the period of Liberal rule. Canada's trade with the world has been more than double that during the same years of Conservative rule, and similar results have followed in our trade with Great Britain and the United States.

Thus has the tariff pledge and policy of the Liberal Government been fulfilled and carried out, a policy that Sir Charles Tupper, the greatest living Canadian statesman, declared, fourteen years ago, would be the ruin of Canada. So much for one of the two chief items that indicate good government, and the encouraged spirit of enterprise, namely activity and growth of trade.

Prosperity of the Peuple.

The other indication of popular prosperity, is revenue results. In 1882, fourteen years previous to the last year of Conservative rule, the revenue, the measure of the purchasing power of the people and of their prosperity, was 35 millions of dollars which grew in fourteen years to 36 millions, an increase of a trifle over \$70,000 a year.

In the first year of Liberal rule. 1897, the year of the Fielding tariff. the revenue was 37 millions. Under fourteen years of this tariff—with a considerably lessened rate of duty—the revenue of the Dominion has advanced to the magnificent figure of 117 and a half millions of dollars, an average increase of \$5,700,000 a year, or 80 times greater than the revenue increase in 14 years of Conservative rule.

Are not these eloquent figures in telling the story of progress under Liberal rule?

They show in abstract form the wonderful growth of the country under wise, bold, aggressive, large-spirited and hopeful administration.

They show—and they are only a part of what recorded figures will

show-that the Liberal Government. since assuming office in 1896. has successfully applied five chief points of policy:

To do everything possible promote the prosperity and welfare

of the whole people;

To administer the affairs of Canada economically, and to collect revenue fairly and equitably, but not unduly:

To develop the great resources of the country on sound principles. and towards that end to promote immigration and to provide trans-portation facilities;

To secure peaceful and harmonious relations between the various elements of the Canadian popula-

To heighten Canada's justification for self respect, to better her standing in the eyes of the world. and, most important of all::

To strengthen and confirm the tics of affection, loyalty and interest that bind us to Britain and the

Empire.

In a word the Liberal Government has made a far different Canada from what they found it in 1896, the time when the administration of its affairs passed into their hands.

Difficult to Convince.

And the Conservative party, especially as at present constituted, in personnel, leadership and spirit, will have some difficulty, in face of their past record of achievement, especially as contrasted with that of the Liberal Government, in convincing the people that it is to their interest to replace Sir Wilfrid Laurier by Mr. R. L. Borden. Mr. Borden is tour-ing the great Canadian West to ask the people—except those he is aiming to do out of a vote—to overturn a Government, which has left its impress on the West in a manner that Mr. Borden will find disconcerting. and which he cannot charm away by any spell of eloquence, charm he never so wisely. As has been pointed out, Mr. Borden, in his present tour in the West, will visit large and prosperous towns and districts where there was no population at all in

He will be driven through miles and miles of farms in places where before 1896 only the gophers worked the land.

He will travel far over the Cana-

dian Pacific main line, now running through a populous country, where just prior to 1896 the Company was ineffectively begging settlers to stay on their farms.

He will travel from Regina to Prince Albert, through a country that before 1896 was condemned as a desert, and where now are the finest farm houses and barns in the whole

Northwest.

He will ride over tour or five lines of railway paralleling the main line of the Canadian Pacific, each after the other, carrying farther and farther northward the vanguard of population and agricultural production.

He will find places that were struggling hamlets before 1896 turned into handsome cities, with paved streets, and with signs everywhere

of prosperity, of wealth, of comfort. In a land which before 1896 cried out for farmers, he will find farmers organized in legions, filled with enthusiasm for the country they work in and eagerly supporting plans of their own for its development, in-

cluding reciprocity.

When Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then leader of the Liberal Opposition. went through the West in 1894, the difficulty was to find the farmer. When Mr. Borden went there in the same role, in 1911, his difficulty was and is to keep out of the way of the farmer. The change that has come over the face of the West, as Mr. Borden will see it, is a change that has come in varying degrees over every province of the Dominion under Liberal rule.

"Let Well Enough Alone".

The cry of the opponents of reci-procity is "Let well enough alone". They say that we are doing well enough now-fenced out by a high tariff from our geographically natural market, a market of 92 millions. They say that we don't need to do a larger and more profitable trade, therefore, we don't need reciprocity. If they believe in that policy of let w ll enough alone, let them apply it to the Liberal Government. We are doing so well under a Liberal Government, have done so well under a Liberal Government, that the people will be inclined to retain servants that have served them well. and decline to exchange them for a Government by a party and policy

of stagnation, that wants to let well enough alone, to sit idly resting as world procession of progress sweeps by us. The people of Canada do not want such a policy or anything akin to such a policy. They are

not built that way.

The Conservative party, as now led. is enough of a stumbling block in the way of legislation, through their parliamentary obstruction. The peo-ple don't want them as a stumbling block, in the way of national pro-

As remarked, the work of the S ssion does not bulk very largely. The business that might have been done was largely prevented by the obstruc-tion of the Opposition and by the time devoted to the discussion or talk on the tariff agreement.

The Greatest Budget.

One oustanding feature of the Session was the budget brought down on April 4th by Hon. W. S. Fielding. Finance Minister. This budget had several unique features. The budget speech was, perhaps, the shortest in words, ever uttered in a Canadian Parliament, occupying only forty minutes in delivery. It was the biggest in delevation gest in declaration of revenue, announcing a total national income of 117% millions of dollars. This permitted the unprecedented achievement of paying out of revenue the total capital expenditure of the year. except three million dollars. provided the greatest surplus ever recorded in Canada—30% million dol-lars, a surplus only a few millions dollars less than the highest total revenue for a full year under Conservative rule and a million dollars more than the total yearly revenue of Canada thirty years ago, which was twenty-nine millions. The debate following the budget was the shortest on record Hon. George E. Foster, the financial expert of the Conservative party. made a few pathetically perfunctory criticisms, the motion to go into Supply was carried and the budget debate, which often consumed weeks on former occasions, was ended.

Keep Good Government.

Now we are asked to dismiss a Government that can, at the end of fourteen years, bring down a budget like that—that shows a three-fold gain of revenue in fourteen years-that can show an unbroken procession of surpluses for thirteen years, totalling 136 million dollars, and offset by only one deficit of \$500,000, the first year of Liberal rule—an aftermath of the long array of deficits under Conservative administration—a Government that can show a record at the end of fourteen years of an increase of total trade of 82 millions of dollars over the previous year. I could amplify these contrasts to a great extent, if time permitted. But I have submitted enough to show that the Liberal Government of the Dominion has by virtue of what it has done, by virtue of its progressive policy and programme of national development, by virtue of its policy of promoting the welfare of the people. by catering to the energetic and enterprising spirit of the people, by providing the means of extensive development of their trade and consequently of their prosperity-that this Government deserves practical consideration at the hands of the electors, when the question of selecting trustees, for the management of the growing business of this great and growing Dominion, comes before them.

The Reciprocity Agreement.

One outstanding feature of the Sesimportant, of the matters introduced into Parliament this Session was the Reciprocity Agreement between Can-ada and the United States—a proposal for enlarged and facilitated trade intercourse between the two countries. Last year the Government settled on terms, favourable to Canada, a tariff question with the United States, which threatened a tariff war. This friendly settlement resulted in a more amicable attitude of the United States. At that time the Government of Canada announced their intention of negotiating a reciprocity treaty with the United States and the Conservatives concurred, offering not the slightest objection. Later it was referred to in the speech from the Throne and nobody took alarm. as some pretend to be alarmed now. The Conservative party in Parliament at that time showed no opposition ,they only feared that the Liberals would not succeed in obtaining reciprocity.

The Reciprocity Agreement, submitted to the House on January 26th. provided for the free exchange of a large list of articles, chiefly what are

called natural products.

First Favour to Farmers.

The removal of duties by this agreement from a large list of soil products, makes it the first important tariff measure proposed by a Canadian Government, purely for the benefit of the great mass of the Canadian people, the farmers and consumers.

It involves a specific consideration for the interests of the farming community that they have never before received since Contederation. The manufacturing interests and the city people have had the lion's share of legislation for the benefit of their peculiar interests; the farmer's benefit was only incidental. But under this Reciprocity agreement, while the interests of the agricultural and producing classes will be promoted the manufacturers and the mechanics will not be injured, but incidentally helped.

You are all doubtless aware that the agreement provides for the entire removal of duties from a rather large list of natural products of both coun-These include live stock. grains, fresh fruits, fresh vegetables. dried fruits, dairy products, eggs, fish salt, lumber, certain minerals, cream separators, and a small list of manufactured articles. The agreement covers another list of articles to be exchanged at a reduced rate of duty. These include fresh meats, bacon. and hams, tinned meats and vegetables, a large number of agricultural implements, etc., etc. Another list contains articles to be admitted to and from both countries at a spe-cial rate of duty, the same for both. There have been both entire removal of duty and reduction of duty upon a large list of articles. And the United States have yielded most, for their reductions are greater. Their tariff being much higher, rendered greater reductions necessary to equalize them with the reductions made by Canada.

Agreement Will Benefit.

This is generally the agreement that is causing such an interest in Parliament and the country.

The Government pelieves, and I believe, that the adoption of the agreement will be for the benefit of the whole of Canada. There are others who think otherwise, and these "others" are largely confined to the Conservative party in Parliament. and the special "interests" centred

chiefly in the cities. It is difficult to understand why, of a sudden, the Conservative leaders-for very many Conservatives favour it-are now antagonizing the concrete application of a policy for which both great par-ties have been striving, for half a century, even as far back as 1818. before Canada was Canada. To do the Conservative party justice they have tried harder to get reciprocity with the United States than the Liberals have done. The Conservatives in 1880, embodied in our statutes a standing offer of reciprocity with the United States. In 1886 it was confirmed by new legislation. In 1887 Sir Charles Tupper declared that both the Canadian and British Governments were doing all they could to secure reciprocity with the United States. In 1888 Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington to try to secure reciprocity. In 1891 another Conservative delegate went to Washington. And also in 1891 Sir John MacDonald fought out the general elections with reciprocity as an issue. In 1891 Sir John Thompson, a member of Sir John's Government, in his address to the electors, said that the Government was appealing to the country on a policy of reciprocity.
by which "he hoped that the United
States would be opened to the products which our people most desire to send there. Products which our people most desire to send there; that is the very essence of the present reciprocity agreement which opens up a free market of 90 millions to the Canadian products, "which we most desire to send there." To show how anxious and industrious the Conservatives were in their search for reciprocity, the Mail and Empire at the close of the Conservative regime, in 1896, proudly boasted that "of the ten offers of reciprocity Canada had made to the United States, nine had been made by Conservatives.

When the Liberals came intopower, in 1896, they made overtures to the United States in regard to reciprocity, but received so little encouragment that Sir Wilfrid declared that he was done with offers of reciprocity; if the United States wanted to discuss reciprocity they must make the first advance. And the United States did re-open the question. President Taft, who, by some

peculiar United States law, cannot. while he is President, leave the country, invited Hon. Wm. Fielding to an informal conference at Albany. and the result was that two United States delegates came to Ottawa, and discussed Reciprocity with the Canadian Government. They laid the foundation for the larger discussion at Washington, where this pending reciprocity agreement was formulated. It was a surprise to many to see the United States thus come out of its shell; but not a greater surprise than to see the many concessions Uncle Sam made to secure a reciprocity arrangement with Canada.

The Foundation of Growth.

I wish to submit briefly a few reasons why I am in favour of the agreement now before Parliament. The expansion of trade is what the country needs to help its advance-nent, it is its foundation of growth. In the interests of trade expansion Canada has spent more money than any country of its population and resources. We have spent on transportation—the machinery of trade—a hundred millions in Canals—a hundred millions on railways, and other millions in steamship subsidies, to enlarge our trade. In the proposed reciprocity agreement, we have a means offered for an immense expansion of trade, to the immense benefit of the people, without spending a dollar. We have a mar-ket of 90 millions of people thrown open to the most valuable products of the country, the products of the soil-grains, forests, and minerals. Next to the production of crops or other articles, the important thing is to find a market, the better and more accessible, the better. We have the home market, the British market. and now we have offered to us the United States market, equal in consuming capacity to both. And the question is: shall we avail ourselves of this market, or refuse it?

Is there Any Disadvantage?

Is there any attendant, or consequent disadvantage in adopting the pending reciprocity agreement? My attitude, and I think the attitude of all who sincerely desire the benefit of Canada—the greatest good to the greatest number — is easily defined. I would not be in favour of anything that would interfere with the industrial interests of the country.

would not be in favour of any trade arrangement that would involve the sacrifice, or interfere with the conservation, of our pulp-wood timber. and other natural resources. Any agreement, or pact, that would contravene these considerations, would have my determined opposition. I have studied the agreement with an open mind, ready to see its defects. as well as its merits. I am not a free trader; neither am I an out-andout protectionist; I am what may be called a modified protectionist. I consider the fairest fiscal policy the one that deals fairly with all of the great classes that compose our productive population—the farmer, the manufacturer, the employee, and the capitalist. Capital must be respected; the employee must have his rights and interests taken into account and the consumer must be considered.

Will Conduce to Prosperity?

I believe that in the adoption of the proposed agreement, these several interests will not only be improved but benefitted. First, the farmer. who, as I have intimated, has never yet had any specific tariff legislation enacted in his interests, has prime consideration in this agreement, and if the farmer is benefitted, incidentally and necessarily all other classes of the community share the advantages. Who takes greater interest in the crop outlook than the capitalists and bankers—a class generally regarded as quite distinct, if not far removed, from the farmer? From this time on we shall see the commercial columns of the daily papers and the financial journals, teeming with crop reports, speculation, and guesses as to the outcome of the Northwest wheat crop and the other crops of the Dominion. Why? Because upon the prosperity of the farm as represented by a good crop is based the forecast of satisfactory financial conditions. Therefore, anything that can conduce to the increase of the farmer's prosperity necessarily involves or affects the prosperity of all classes of the community. The agreement, as I have pointed out, provides for reciprocity—free mutual exchange—of natural products—the products of the soil—with the United States.

Value of the New Market.
This means a new and enlarged

market, a convenient market for the products of the farm, the mine, the forest and the fisheries, the orchard. the fruit garden, and the dairy. We now have the nome market. Canada, with its population of less than eight millions cannot consume half of what we are capable of producing; it would be as reasonable to expect a farmer's family to consume all that a well-tilled farm would produce. We have the British market, that is our natural market, politically, but it is 3,000 miles away. Trade is a good deal like corporations, soulless, or like water, that takes the easiest way to find its natural level. For years, the British market has been wide open-free to al' the products of Canada. The United States market has been barricadec to Canada, by a high tariff wall. Yet, in the past twenty years, in spite of the barrier, the total trade with the hampered market has been larger than with the free-the family market, Great Britain. The following are the figures of the trade for twenty years:

Canada exports to Canada exports to United States Great Britain

1891 . . \$40,194,566 \$49,280,558 1901 . . 59,962,905 105,320,556 1910 . . 110,614,327 149,630,488

Total trade, including Bullion— United States Great Britain 1891 . .\$100,784,905 91,357,784 1901 . .185,595,577 148,498,253 1910 . .351,221,327 245,313,984

It is thus seen that in spite of tariff obstacles, our trade with the United States has been larger than with Great Britain, and has grown much more rapidly. Trade has followed the natural channel, geographically. though this channel has been dammed with tariff obstructions.

Still that twenty years has seen the absolute and complete disappearance of any slight feeling in Canada favourable to United States political institutions.

And in that twenty years the tie of affection and political unity between Canada and Great Britain, has grown stronger as our trade has grown comparatively less than with the

United States. This shows that filthy lucre is not the only measure of loyalty, something to be recalled when considering the absurd claim that reciprocity will lead to annexation.

A Little History.

Before dealing further with the probable beneficial effects of reciprocity. a little historical evidence may be presented. The beneficial effects of the reciprocity treaty of 1854-66, and the deplorable trade results from its abolition, may be referred to. Lord Elgin, then Governor-General of Canada, secured the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. This treaty was practically on all fours with the present agreement in that it provided for free interchange of natural products. and its general fish, included, scope corresponded closely with the pending agreement of 1911. It was abrogated in 1866 by the United States really because of the difference of the two countries over the Civil War.

We have excellent Conservative authority that this treaty was a great boon to Canadian trade and commerce. When abrogation of the treaty was threatened the Canadian Government of the day (Conservative. with Sir John, then plain John A. Macdonald at its head). entreated the British Government to leave no measures untried "to avert what would be regarded by the Canadian people as a great calamity.

The re port, regarding regarding re ciprocity abrogation—the appeal to the British government to retain reciprocity—drawn by Sir John A. Macdonald, or with his approval, went on to say:

"It would be impossible to express "in figures, with any approach to "accuracy, the extent to which the "facilities of commercial intercourse "created by the reciprocity treaty "have contributed to the wealth and "prosperity of this province (Can-"ada was only a "province" then), "and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the "people of Canada attach to the "continued enjoyment of these fa-"cilities."

If freer trade in natural products when the "province of Canada" was small, its trade comparatively trifling and its resources little developed, was so great a boon and its loss so great

a calamity; then, when Canada's resources are greater, its trade a hundred fold more important, when her political situation is more assured and self-contained, will freer trade be less beneficial or hampered trade less injurious?

Many Demands.

While the pending trade agreement is generally in the interests of the country, it does not meet all demands. Some farming interests have not had their full demands met by it. But in a general measure, it is impossible to What afcover every requirement. fects one section favourably, may be to the disadvantage or the lesser advantage of another. The deputation of Northwest farmers that visited Ottawa in strong force, demanded the removal of the duty from agricultural implements and the advance of the British Preference - demands, practically equivalent to free trade. There be to some selfishacems these demands. in farmers of the Northwest seemed to forget that the working men and the manufacturers also have rights. Ontario, a manufacturing Province, has contributed in men and money to the development of the West, and now an almost complete removal or reasonable protection, in some regards, for the manufacturer and the working man, is demanded in the form of 50 per cent. advance in the British Preference. I do not favour this. The British Preference is hard enough on our manufacturers now. To double it is to practically throw Canadian manufacturing industry open to the formidable competition of the British manufacturer. This would not be in the interests of either manufacturer or working man in Canada.

The agreement has been drawn to reasonably meet the wishes and promote and conserve the interests of both, East and West. Unreasonable demands on the part of either the industrial interests of the East or the farming interests of the West, are hostile to the harmony of the Dominion.

Manufacturers Not Affected.

We had also at Ottawa a deputation of manufacturers—a visit which had little reason for its coming. What have the manufacturers to be alarmed at? There is no occasion for alarm. The reciprocity agreement affects manufactured products very slightly.

There is a reduction of 2 1-2 per cent. on agricultural implements, and of 5 1-2 on cement. There is little ground for complaint on the part of the manufacturers of these articles. A protective duty is designed to protect from destructive outside competition. Early in the Session a Conservative member from the West, introduced a resolution calling for the abolition of the duty on agricultural implements. This was evidently a political dodge, for the resolution has hung fire since last November and has not been brought forward.

Sir Wilfrid's Assurance.

It is a human impossibility to frame a tariff that will meet the needs of every interest, that will not quite beneficially affect some industry. But this reciprocity agreement only slightly affects manufactured products and that is one reason why I am in favour of it. The Canadian negotiators of the agreement had this in mind when they went to Washington. President Taft wanted to include in the discussion. reciprocity, in manufactured products. But Mr. Fielding flatly refused. He told the United States that Canada would meet them half way in natural products, but not in manufactured goods. He realized that United States' manufacturers had more highly specialized systems and could produce at a smaller cost than some Canadian manufacturers. And he refused to consider for a moment general reciprocity in manufactured products. Manufacturers have nothing to fear from reciprocity and the general tariff policy of the Liberal Government. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has explicitly stated: "We have not hurt the manufacturer and will not hurt him." And speaking at Montreal, Mr. Fielding reassured the manufacturers. He said:
"We are ready to stand by the

"We are ready to stand by the "manufacturer whenever he has a "fair case. We have always tried "to be frank and fair with the man-"ufacturers and they should still "trust us. We have cared for your "interests in the past and we shall "continue to care for them in the "future. There is no politics in tar-"iff and industrial questions."

This assurance as well as the facts themselves, discredit the cry that the reciprocity agreement will ruin our manufacturing industries.

The manufactured articles admitted into Canada under the agreement are

so few and unimportant that they can have no appreciable effect on any of our industries.

Free Exchange No Injury.

Then how will the free exchange of the products of our farms, fisheries and forests, so far as the latter are free, affect other industries that are not touched by the tariff changes involved in the reciprocity agreement? The agitators and opponents of the agreement, have read into it a great deal that it does not contain. To be more specific, one might inquire how reciprocity, as proposed, will injure the working man or the manufacturer? How will the free interchange of potatoes, turnips and cabbages, injure the Canadian General Electric Company? The reduced or modified tariff does not affect any of its output, but a stiff tariff will, and might easily, affect them adversely. How can the free exchange of farm products interfere with the William Hamilton Company, in the production of turbines and saw mill machinery? Will not free lumber and timber stimulate the lumber business and create increased demand for our mill machinery, especially in view of the fact that sixty five per cent. of our lumber is exported?

Will Not Affect Local Industries.

How will a wider market, adding to the farmer's prosperity injure the Peterborough Lock Manufacturing Company, unless by increased capacity for the purchase of its products? How will the four Canoe Companies of Peterborough suffer from the free exor by change of plums or potatoes the reduction of the United States' duties on canoes from 35 to 22 1-2 per cent. or the reduction of the Canadian duty from 25 to 22 1-2 per cent.? With skilled employees, trained in the home of the canoe, with cheaper and more accessible raw material, cannot our canoe builders successfully compete with their opponents in the United States on better terms, especially when their export trade will be helped by a reduction of 12 1-2 per cent., to a larger market and greatly increas-How will the Colonial ed business. Weaving Company do anything but gain by the increased prosperity that will improve the demand for their products-labels for clothing, boots and shoes and other goods. How will the Brinton Carpet Company be injured by increased prosperity, through larger trade, furnishing a better home market? How will the Rapid Tool Company suffer from cheaper raw material, cheaper coal and a more active home market? How will knocking off 40 cents a bushel on onions or two cents on a head of cabbage, affect the prosperity of the Lundy Shovel & Tool Company, or decrease the wages of its employees? Will the Brewery suffer? It may do so to some extent. Free barley may lead to increased prices, but compensation will come from the Brewery's standpoint by a better market and prices, giving the farmer more money to exchange for its finished products. The Lubricator Company is in no way affected prejudicially. The Quaker Oats Company and the Matthews Company claim to be adversely affected, and at first sight this seems reasonable.

Forebodings Not Justified.

But there may be compensating advantages and forebodings of disaster are not always justified. Prophesiers of evil often make mistakes. the Fielding Liberal tariff was introduced in 1897, Sir Charles Tupper from his place in the House, foretold the ruin of the manufacturing industries; they were "paralyzed" in advance and there "rose the wail, the sorrowful wail" of ruined manufacturers, and he "deplored the ruin" that would fall upon the industries of Canada as a result of the Fielding tariff. Yet we all know, and no one will be found to deny, that under the tariff the industries of Canada have prospered as they never prospered before. doleful forecasts have Sir Charles' been splendidly discredited, and even Mr. Sifton, who opposes the reciprocity agreement, admits, and even asserts, that it is the "best fiscal policy the Dominion ever had." Is this not a probability that the prophets of evil in respect of reciprocity will be similarly mistaken? Is there not a probability that even the rare few of industries that fear they will be injuriously affected, may, be happily mistaken?

Give It a Trial.

Is it not wise, then, having in view the splendid working of the old Reciprocity treaty and the promise of the present agreement, to enlarge our markets and increase our prosperity, to accept it as a good thing? Would

it not be wise to take the advice of Mr. Harry Corby, Conservative Ex-M.P.: "Give the agreement a trial?"

This is good advice. This agreement embodies a policy for which both parties have been working since Confederation. Then why are Conservativessome Conservatives (the politicians) and others opposing it? Is it from conviction or desire to make party capital? Now, I am a pretty strong party man, and would not complain at party tactics, so long as they did not interfere with the interests of the country. But when party tactics antagonize national interests, it seems to be carrying the thing too far. As I have shown, both parties have been striving for reciprocity the past nearly fifty years. Even a year ago the Conservative party did not oppose reciprocity-when Mr. Fielding told them that, the Government proposed, in answer to overtures of the United States, to obtain reciprocity. But the moment a trade agreement was announced, as soon as they could find excuses for it, the Conservative politicians-not the Conservative party as a whole, but the leaders-ranged themselves against it. Now, what is the bulk of the opposition to the reciprocity agreement? It does not come from the farming community, because the agreement is designed to promote their interests.

And there is no doubt that freer trade, enlarged markets — more convenient markets—for the products of the farm, will immensely benefit the

farmer.

The farmers have good reason to distrust the friend that pretends to oppose reciprocity, because it will injure the farmers.

Opposition Not Justifiable.

The opposition is not based on a discussion of the subject on its merits. The agitation is designed to confuse, misguide and mislead the mass-As a Western newspaper says, the agitation has been "nursed, stagemanaged, advertised and financed." The special interests are interests that will not be affected directly-and then not injuriously, by reciprocity—the manufacturing and the financial interests. For exactly the span of a generation-since 1878-the manufacuring interests have had the benefits of a very reasonable and liberal degree of protection, by tariff, and it passes understanding that they should be up in

arms against a tariff arrangement in the form of a reciprocity agreement that for the first time in nearly sixty years, practically recognizes the farmers' claims to consideration. If reciprocity was the terrible thing this organized Opposition asserts, would not the farmers be against it to a man? Every device is employed to mislead

Every device is employed to mis and frighten the farmer.

Farmers Benefitted.

They tell the Canadian farmer that he can't compete with the farmers of the United States. Will any Canadian farmer say that he is not as wide-awake, as ahrewd, as intelligent, as a United States' farmer? We all know that Canada, owing to the longer daylight in the West, grows the best wheat in the world. We know that Canadian apples are better than Uni-ted States' apples—the farther north apples will ripen the better the quality, and the same applies to small fruits. A Niagara district fruit farmer says, that when the United States strawberries are selling at 6c. and 7c. per quart. "he can take his Canadian berries into the market and sell them righ alongside of theirs" at 15c, and the same holds good of peaches and raspherries, etc. We know that when Canadian small fruits come in. the earlier fruits from the United States become a drug on our market, and ours are so superior in quality that they are in demand in the United States' cities. An United States' trade journal a couple of months ago contained a statement of "one of the largest handlers of fruit farm produce in the United States." Speaking in the interests of the United States' farmers and of the competition of Canadian farm products, the article thus compares the respective farm products. It says:

"Potatoes—New Brunswick (Canada) can grow double the crop of New York State.

"Cabbage—Can be grown in Ontario double the weight per acre in New York State.

"Apples. (fresh) — She (Canada) grows better apples than America. "Oats—Prince Edward Island and other parts of Canada grow double the crop per acre to what is grown in many parts of America. "Sheep and Jorke"

"Sheep and Lambs — Everbody knows Canada's sheep are larger."

Here is an authority that handles,

in a commercial way, the products of both countries and knows what he is talking about. And we know that what he says is correct, and that the superiority of Canadian produce applies to other things. We all know that Canada, especially along the lake front, and in Central Ontario, grows the best malting barley on the con-tinent, and that when it was admitted to the United States under the old reciprocity treaty it commanded the highest price. Who will say that Canadian farmers cannot compete with their Yankee brother farmers? What is the game of the new friends of the farmer? Why are interests that are not injured by reciprocity so anxious to defect it? Why are they spending thousands of dollars in fighting reciprocity? They only pretend to sympathuse with the farmer and pretend to be sorry for him. These "interests" have never shown any anxiety for the farmer before, and they are now trying to hoodwink him into helping play their game. The real farmers, the bone and sinew, are in favour of reciprocity on account of the larger market and better prices it opens to them. No Crop-Producing Interest Hurt.

There is no ground for the fear that it will injure any crop-producing interest in Canada. There was a deputation of fruit growers went to Ottawa, one of the most unreasonable of all the deputations, that went to protest against the agreement. We all know about the early fruits sent in here from the United States—sent in at a time when Canadian fruit growers have nothing to sell or consumers nothing to buy. The Canadian duty of 2c. per pound being removed, the price will be lessened and a man of moderate means can afford a luxury now only enjoyed by the rich. But the moment home fruits come into the market, there is no sale for imported Fruit is an article that needs quick handling - it speedily spoils. For most of our fruit we have now only the Toronto and Montreal markets. And these are soon glutted. Who that has visited Toronto in the fruit season, has not seen fruit rotting on the wharves for lack of purchasers, and dealers willing to take any price to get rid of it? With the United States' duty of 25c. a bushel on peaches and pears removed-with the tax of 25c. per cubic foot on boxes or crates of grapes, removed, it would

pay to ship these to the United States' With our modern rapid market. transportation and cold storage, berries and pears and peaches and grapes can be gathered in the evening in Canada and put in good condition on the markets of Buffalo, Boston, New York or Rochester, the next morning, where the demand is unlimited and the native United States supply inadequate to meet the demand, and with brisk demand comes good prices. Niagara fruit farmers who have been marketing in the United States for twenty years, say they never saw peaches as cheap as they are in Canada. With the duty of 25c. per bushel, prices are 25 per cent. better in the United States. In the United States' cities, near the border, raspberries sell for sic. or 9c. per quart, but Canadian berries as soon as they are ripe, sell for 13c. to 15c. a quart. In the Niagara district, the prices of fruit lands have advanced at the very prospect of re-ciprocity. Not only will reciprocity bring better markets, better prices and bigger profits for the present crop of fruits, but it will encourage the immense expansion of the business. The only persons connected with the fruit industry that dislike reciprocity are the canners. The larger and betfor market in the United States will, they fear, bring up prices and they will have to pay higher figures to the Canadian growers for fruit to use in So much for the their canneries. fruit growers, who sent a politically inspired deputation to Ottawa to protest against reciprocity. So will it be with most of the objections urged against reciprocity; they disappear on investigation and analysis.

The Plaint of the Millers.

It is also claimed that the milling industry of Canada will be injured by reciprocity. How will this happen? Under the agreement, wheat passes between the two countries free of duty. How will the reduction of 25c. duty per bushel on wheat in the United States' tariff or of 12c. in the Canadian tariff work any ruin? Canadian wheat goes into the United States practically free under the present tariff. A drawback of 99 per cent. is given on the duty on Canadian wheat ground in the United States for export. Will a difference of 1 per cent. in duty ruin the Canadian miller? Is the Canadian miller doing so badly now that a difference of one per cent duty

on wheat going into the United States will ruin him? Somebody in Canada now makes a profit out of the reduc-tion of wheat to flour. At a recent date, when the wholesale price of flour in Winnipeg was \$2.95, co-opera-tive societies in Britain were able to buy it at such a price as made the wholesale price in England, \$2.50 per hundred; that is, 45 cents cheaper a hundred after a journey of 3,000 miles, than it was within a mile of where the wheat grew, from which it was ground. The disparity is greater in the retail way. At the time a 7 pound sack of flour was Sie. in Toronto, or at the rate of \$4.28 a hundred, a 7 pound sack of the same grade of Canadian flour was 22c., or at the rate of \$3.14 per hundred, in Man-chester, England. If the milling industry can produce flour to be sold at a profit in England, they must make a tidy profit out of the increased price the Canadian consumer has to pay, without any charges for transporta-tion across the ocean. Why cannot Canadian millers compete with the United States as successfully as before? The millers of both countries can get Canadian wheat at the same price, as far as tariff affects the price. All the advantage the Canadian miller had before the agreement was proposed, was one per cent., counting the 99 per cent. drawback to the United States miller. So that all the Canadian miller will, at the worst, suffer from reciprocity, if he suffers at all, will be the removal of the one per cent. duty on Canadian wheat entering the United States. With its superior possession and distribution of water powers Canada, should be able to hold the home market for flour, and invade the United States' market on equal terms-the duty on flour being the same in both countries, and also compete successfully for the export trade. I believe in reasonable protection to Canadian industries, but I fail to see how the milling industry is to be greatly injured, by the re-ciprocity agreement. He has the advantage over the United States miller, that the latter has a market of only eight millions, while the Canadian miller has a market of 92 million, and both on the same terms. While the Canadian miller has no tariff protection, he has the advantage of direct and first access to home grown wheat, superior manufacturing facilities in the form of superior water pow-

ers, and a ten-fold larger foreign market at his very door.

The Canadian millers do not seem to suffer very seriously from the re-

of proof ty agreement.

If the Canadian miller can sell flour in England et a profit at a much lower price than in Canada. then he has the matter of profits in his own hands. It seems to me, therefore, that under reciprocity the milling industry can reasonably well take care of itself.

The Annexation Bogm.

One of the most absurd of the contentions advanced against reciprocity is that the unobstructed exchange of farm products between Canada and the United States will lead to an-

Last year, the total trade of Canada with the United States, exports and imports, amounted to \$321,000,000. That has made no difference in our political relations. If the trade is doubled, as a result of reciprocity will it develop annexation? As a matter of fact there never was a time in our history when there was as great an absence of sentiment looking to political union with the United States as at present. There might have been, at odd times, during the past sixty years, a little annexation sentiment. About the only annexation sentiment ever existent in Canada was of Conservative manufacture-made in Montreal City sixtythree years ago, and the business has been revived by some of the Conservative opponents of reciprocity in 1911. In 1848 an "annexation league" was formed in Montreal, and a "manifesto" in favour of annexation was signed by prominent "Tor-ies," among them Sir John Abbott. afterwards head of a Conservative Government. This action brought about by the desire for enlarged trade relations with the United States. The agitation was confined to a few political fillibusters, and it never entered at large into the minds of the Canadian people, to swap their British allegiance for United States trade. So little dia the reciprocity treaty of 1854 excite the political sympathy of Canadians with the United States, that the latter made the blunder of thinking that the repeal of the treaty would force Canada into annexation. The United States abrogated the reciprocity treaty to

force annexation. Now, we have it argued that reciprocity is proposed

to promote annexation.
Of all the absurd objections to re-

ciprocity—that of its being a step to annexation, is the most abourd. Bishop Mills, of Kingston, in his charge, at the opening of the Envlish Church Synod, deals effectively with the ridiculous contention, as follows:

I would think little of my loyalty to the British Crown and the British Empire; if it depended on tariff schedules. Those who think the national spirit of Canada is such a poor and uncertain thing, that her existence as a nation, would be imperilled by an increase of trade with the United States, certainly do not know her. There is no part of the British Empire, in which there is truer loyalty than in Canada. and she can be nember hought nor sold.

Exactly in the middle of the old reciprocity treaty, which lasted from 1854 to 1866, the Prince of Wales. afterwards King Edward, visited Canada-1860. Never before, or since. did Canada give a heartier demonstration of loyalty, than in the midst of reciprocity, which we are now told will lead to annexation. And if the present agreement goes into force, and the present Prince of Wales were to visit Canada, he would find the same loyal devotion to the throne. and the same unalterable determination to maintain British connection, and Imperial relations.

No Danger.

There is, however, not the slightest danger of Canada losing its independence to the United States. We have heard that sort of argument ever since Canada was Canada. Every one of the successive reforms in this country, that have given us the best form of Government and the best political, civil and social conditions in the world, has been fought against to the tune of annexation and disruption of the Empire. When the Liberals of that 'me were fighting for representative Government. the parent of all the liberties you enjoy, they were met with the cry of annexation. There is an exception. When the "Tories" were in power. in 1854, the Government of Sir Francis Hinck, through Lord Elgin. accepted the reciprocity treaty. This

treaty led to immediate prosperity. Did closer trade relations sap the loyalty of Canadians, and warp them into annexation? An answer to this lies in the fact that r dozen years later the Canadian Confederation was established. There may be a few fill-bustering politicians in the United States who are desirous of annexing Canada. But if freer trade will lead to annexation Uncle Sam has the means ready to hand. If Canadians are such cravens as to surrender their British connection because a few duties are removed, the United States. without consulting Canada, or any-body, can lower its duties, and, according to the hypocritical alarmists. gather Canada into its fold.

But every day they see that dream of Yankee filibusters further from realisation. Canada, nerself, has to be reckoned with. We are too well satisfied with our position—"daughter in our mother's house, mistress in our own"-self-governing in all important essentials, and still, proud and jealous of our British connection. We love our institutions, our privileg s too dearly to barter them for idvantages. We have too high of our future as an autonomic nat.on on this continent to think for one moment c! change.

We value our relations with the great Empire of Britain too highly to change, or surrender, them for any material advantage. As Sir Wilfrid Laurier has said: We Canadians have set our hearts upon building up a nation without separation from the Empire." There is no danger of annexation from closer trade rela-tions, or any other cause. As I have mentioned, the only germ of annexation in the years 1848-54, that ever existed in Canada, was crushed when the reciprocity treaty of 1854-66 was negotiated. Reciprocity killed annexation—then, is it unreasonable to say that reciprocity now will work its resurrection ?

The Financial Interests.

The financial interests some cases, and in some respects. arrayed against the reciprocity agreement. Sir William Van Horne, on his return from Cuba, on learning of the reciprocity agreement, said he was "too sick and ashamed" of it to express his sorrow. Sir William was in Cuba, investing the money made in Canada in a foreign country. Sir Edmund Walker is also against the agreement—it is treason for farmers to sell their products in the United States

He is the controlling spirit of a great Bank (the Bank of Commerce, and gathers the savings of tens of thousands of Canadian farmers and sends them across the line to make profits—to even help move the South-

rn cotton crop.

Yet he denies the farmers of Canada the right by way of reciprocity to ship his farm stuff across the line. What is right for him to do is wrong for the farmer. While the right of banks to employ their funds wherever they can make a legitimate profit is conceded, a similar right should not be denied the farmers who create the whole wealth of the country, that makes the banks rich and powerful. For, generally speaking, all wealth comes from the soil-in the form of grain or minerals or timber. If it is wrong, if it will injure our prosperity and swamp our loyalty to trade freely in natural products with the United States, why will it not have the same effect to deal with them in money? The banks of Canada as they hav a right to do, have large interests in the United States. The banks of Canada have, altogether, 177 branches in the cities of the United States, Sir Edmund Walker's bank has six een branches, the Royal bank seventeen and Molson's bank fifteen. If the loyalty of the banks is proof ngainst the peril of doing business in the United States, cannot the Canadian farmers' loyalty be expected to stand the s ain of buying and sell ing-dealing with our neighbours?

The financial interests that oppose reciprocity which primarily only, affects the farmers, promoting their interests, by adding a new and larger market to the home and British market, are selfish in demanding privileges for themselves which they would

deny to farmers.

Capital Unafraid.

Capital has no fears that reciprocity will injure any interests of the

country.

Capital is extremely sensitive to the influence of threatening or probable adverse conditions in commerce or industry. Since the reciprocity agreement was announced, capital has been actively initiating great new enterprises, showing that reci-

procity means no danger to our manufacturing industries. A few out of many projected enterprises may be mentioned. A fifty million dollar plough company, the Deere Company with headquarters at Moline, Iowa. as acquired lands at Welland to establish a factory larger than any of its kind in Canada, to employ several thousand men, in the manufacture of plows and agricultural implements, generally. The Western Steel Coroporation of Canada has purchased 2,000 acres on the Fraser River, B.C., and acquired coal and iron mines, looking to the establishment of an immense business. In April, three months after the blue ruinists had destroyed Canadian industries by reciprocity, a charter was granted a ten-million-dollar company, to establish a ship-building plant at Sydney harmour, Nova Scotia. We have been told that the United States factories that established themselves in Canada, to supply the Canadian market, would disappear. Yet, as if in answer to this the Oliver Plough Company of Hamilton, arranged to add a \$600,000 plant, to supply the Canadian demand. A British firm is building a three-million dollar graving dock at Montreal. And this, in face of the fact, as asserted by opponents of the agreement, that reciprocity will dry up our canals and rivers, and turn Canadian traffic down the Mississippi. Similar examples of new enterprises might be mentioned, but these will serve to show that reciprocity has no fears from capital and enterprise.

Wont Divert Traffic.

Then we are told that reciprocity will destroy our great transportation systems by diverting Canadian East and West trade to trade on north and south lines. No thinking man takes any stock in this objection: even the Conservative politicians. themselves, do not believe it—they only use it as one weapon in their armoury to mislead the people. If there were the slightest fear of reciprocity diverting the channels of Canadian trade to north and south lines, all railway enterprise would be paralyzed. If our existing railway lines were ruined it would be madness to build others. Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann are building the third cross-continent railway. They applied

to Parliament for a guarantee of the bonds of the Canadian Northern to complete the thousand-mile gap between Port Arthur and Montreal, to span the continent. The proposal to give the Government guarantee to the bonds, \$35,000,000 or \$35,000 per mile for 1,000 miles, passed the House with the approval of the Conservatives—not one voting against it.

If the Conservatives had really believed themselves—had believed their contention that reciprocity would destroy our transportation systems they would have raised heaven and earth to defeat the guarantee proposal, instead of unanimously assent-

ing to it.

Financiers and stock dealers keep a keen eye on matters that affect the price of stocks. A public measure that would injure-not to say ruina railway, would send down its stock with a run. The opponents of reciprocity say that reciprocity will ruin our transcontinental railways by sending trade north and south-that is. through the United States. The buyers of C.P.R. stock didn't see much ruin of the C. P. R., or any of the industries or national enterprises that makes its traffic and its prosperity its dividends. When, on Jan. 26th, Mr. Fielding announced the reciprocity agreement, C.P.R. stock stood at 209. From that time it began to rise. The more the opponents of reciprocity ruined the country and the railwaysthe more the stock of the C.P.R. rose. It steadily advanced, in face of the prophecies of ruin, till, on June 30th, it reached 241 ,having previously touched 242.Isn't it singular that the stock of a railway on the down grade of ruin through reciprocity should rise against the tide of destruction sweeping over Canada? Instead of reciprocity ruining the C. P. R., it promises to help it according to the shrewdest of financial men-the dealers in stocks.

Shorter Canadian Routes.

There is a reason why the C. P.R. can pay big dividends in competition with the United States' railways and Canadian transportation routes can hold their own. The distance by way of the present Canadian water route from Fort William or Duluth is shorter by 500 miles than the existing United States' water route, and the present rail and water routes between these points are 700 to 800

miles shorter than the existing United States' rails and water routes. There is, therefore, very little weight in the claim that reciprocity will ruin Canadian transportation lines by diversing trade north and south. The Canadian routes will have the preference, as shown by the great growth of shipment by these routes as against the increase by United States' routes. In 1900 the total amount of Canadian wheat exported from Montreal was 4,000,000 bushels. And in 1910, the amount shipped by the Canadian route was 14,000,000. same time the exports of United States' wheat by the Canadian route had doubled-advanced from 4,000,-000 in 1900 to 10,000,000 in 1910.

The Favoured Nation's Scare.

Another objection to reciprocity is that it will subject Canada to the competition of the twelve favoured nations which are, by British treaties, entitled to the same reduction of tariff Canada gives any other country, in this case to the United States, under

the reciprocity agreement.

These countries are: Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Spain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Japan, Bolivia, Columbia, Venezuela, and the Argentine Republic. These countries now ship a little to Canada, but the proportion of articles covered by the reciprocity agreement is very small. Out of a total of \$14,000,000 imported from the favoured nations, only \$500,000 was composed of articles made free by the reciprocity agreement, and that out of a total importation of \$475,000,000. Let us compare the trade we do with these favoured nations to show how trifling will be the importation of articles affected by the pending trade agreement. We can exclude Great Britain for there is no prospect of that country shipping any farm products to Canada, or any other products affected by the reciprocity agreement. Last year's Canadian trade with Venezu-ela consisted of exports to that country of \$14,000 and imports of \$53,000. and in this \$53,000 we do not find any of the natural products affected by reciprocity. From Switzerland last year Canada imported a value of \$2,633,-000 and exported to Switzerland, \$10,-000 ;our imports were chiefly fine manufacture of silk and cotton. Last year Sweden took \$111,000 worth of our goods and not a dollar's worth of

any article affected by the reciprocity agreement with the United States was included in the \$207,000 worth of imports from that country. We sent Spain last year \$51,000 worth and our imports from Spain of \$1,040,000, chiefly of tropical fruit, not included in the agreement. Our trade with Russia last year consisted of exports, \$59,000 and imports, \$138,000, and there will not be found among the latter a single article covered by the agreement. Included in our trade with Norway were exports of \$487,000 and imports of \$108,000, including some fish, and Norway getting the benefit of free represents the first item in which a favoured nation gets the benefit under the agreement, and we are not much afraid of Norway fish. Our trade with Denmark consisted last year of exports, \$425,000 and imports \$86,000. Denmark is a very large butter exporting country, but our imports from that country did not include a single pound of butter. With the State of Columbia, our trade amounting to exports \$32,000, and imports \$28,000, included nothing affected by the agreement, and with Bolivia we have no trade of any kind. From Austria-Hungary we imported \$1,410,000 and exported \$60,000. The imports were chiefly laces and that sort of thing that are not mentioned in the agreement. When we come to the Argentine Republic, the great rival of Canada, according to the blue ruinists, we find that we sold them \$2,869,000 worth, and imported from that country \$4,-181,000, and in this large amount there was not included an article subject to the reciprocity agreement. Then we have some trade with Japan, but who is afraid of Japan sending us strawberries or hay or barley or any other cereals such as reciprocity makes free? We are told that the Argentine, being a great wheat growing country, will ship wheat to Canada. It has not done so, so far, and if it ships wheat to Canada, then Canada can ship wheat to the Argentine. But when this happens. Sydney will be sending and Newcastle coals to Newcastle sending coals to Sydney.

Sir Wilfrid's Way.

It will thus be seen that there is nothing in the contention that the reciprocity agreement will turn upon Canada a flood of imports that will compete injuriously with Canadian farm products and other products

mentioned in the reciprocity agreement.

But if there were any danger of injurious competition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier's splendid stand at the Imperial Conference in London has found a way to cancel the favoured nation's clauses in British treaties, as they apply—and especially if they apply prejudicially—to the self-governing Dominions. This would give the Dominions perfect commercial freedom.

Sir Wilfrid is accused by his enemies with being a separationist, but Sir Edward Grey, British Foreign Secretary, has no fear that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's plan to give the Dominions larger powers will lead to separation, but rather to closer connection with the Empire, resulting from removal of causes of commercial friction and discontent.

A Comparison.

Now, it will be interesting to compare the value and importance of our trade with these countries—called the favoured nation competitors—and the United States. In the year 1910 the trade of the United States with Canada was \$341,000,000.

The trade of the United States with Canada was only exceeded by that with the United Kingdom and Germany-\$775,000,000 and \$420,000,000 respectively. In the year 1910 the United States did nearly eight times as much trade with Canadians as with the whole of the Central American States. In that year the trade of the United States with Canada was about half of the total trade with the entire North American continent, including Central America, Mexico, Newfoundland, the British and other West Indies, and Cuba, the total being \$691,000,000 as against \$310,000,000 with Canada. With South America, including the dreaded Argentine Re-With South America, public and Brazil, the trade of the United States was \$20,000,000 less than with Canada. With China, Japan and the British Indies, with their hun-dreds of millions of inhabitants, the trade of the United States was \$55,-000,000 less than with Canada. With Australia and the French and German Colonies, 301 th of the equator. the gross trade of the United States So it is seen that was \$90,000,000. the gross trade of the United States with Canada was almost equal to their trade with the whole of Asia and the

Islands of the Sea. In the face of these facts and figures, who will deny that our nearest neighbour, numbering more than 90,000,000, is our natural market, and most convenient market, and one worth getting free access to with our natural products in which we can compete with the world? When we consider that we lie alongside United States for 3,000 miles. And when we consider that at many points along these borders we are able to meet the wants of our neighbours and that at other points they can meet ours, and, moreover, if with a hostile tariff against each other, the two countries do a large trade mutually profitable and desirable, is not that a strong argument for the adoption of the reciprocity agreement, which removes the obstructions to trade and permits free exchange of products, for which a ready, convenient and profitable market is desired? Is not that a strong argument on ++ adoption of the reciprocity agreement, which removes the obstruction to trade and permits free exchange of products from which Canadian farmers desire a ready,, convenient and profitable

These products, as I have generally indicated, are composed, in the main. of products of the soil, forest, fisheries, and mines.

The Articles Affected.

Let me submit, in a little more detail the articles covered by the agreement, the appended figures. showing the reduction of duty in each case:

Cattle less than one year
old,\$2.00
Cattle valued at more than
\$14.00
Horses valued at \$150\$30.00
Horses valued at over \$15025%
Swine\$1.50 each
Sheep and lambs, less than
one year\$1.50 each
Poultry, alive 3c per lb.
Poultry, dead
Cream 5c per gal.
Oats 15c per bush.
Barley 30c per bush.
Potatoes25c per bush.
Turnips
Cabbage 2c each
Apples 25c per bush.
Berries of all kindslc per qt.
Dried apples 2c per lb.
Butter6c per lb.

Cheese							.6c	per	lb.
Eggs									
Hay	0	 	 	۰		\$1	1.00	per	ton
Straw .		 	 			8	1.50	per	ton

This list comprises the chief articles of natural products, that is farm and dairy products that interest Ontario. Free fish and salt are, of special interest to the sea-side provinces and free coke and free lumber concern all parts of Canada, which are also interested in the free list that particularly affects Ontario. It will be seen that many of the duties to be removed, under the agreement, were practically prohibitory of profitable trade intercourse, which is now opened to the farmers of Canada.

Value of U. S. Market.

But we are told that the United States market will be of no advantage to us. That they produce the same things we produce, and that their market is of no value to us. This, however, is not the case. It is a fact that the population of the United States is growing more rapidly than the soil production, and that the time is not far distant, when domestic products will not meet the home demand. As things are now the home demand is lessening the volume of exports. The report of the United States Secretary of Agriculture shows that the beef exports of 1909 were 57 per cent. short of those of 1906. The report says: "In lesser degree than beef, pork exports indicate a similar decline in the national supply."

The United States export of wheat and wheat flour, expressed in terms of wheat, fell from \$163,000,000 bushels in 1908, to \$114,000,000 in 1909. Thus we see that the United States. which is now, to a large extent importing agricultural products from Canada, will continue to increase its demand of wheat and other farm products we have to sell. As the United States decreases in production and in capacity to supply its own wants. Canada is yearly increasing its production by leaps and bounds. In 1909 one million people in the Canadian West produced 147 million bushels of wheat from 7 million acres, a yield per acre in excess of that of any great wheat-growing country in the world. We have, at a conservative estimate, 213 millions of acres in the Canadian wheat belt.

Suppose only a comparatively small quantity of that land is brought under cultivation, and our population of the Northwest increases to 5 million or 6 million, as it promises to do in a few years, it is easy to calculate what our wheat production will be. With population increased six times and wheat acreage 6 times. the crop will correspondingly increase. That will mean 750 million bushels of wheat in a year, within a few years; and it is not extravagant to anticipate in the not too distant future, a Canadian wheat crop of 1,000 million bushels. Our products of other grains in the North West. and other parts of Canada will increase with our wheat, and as we have now, we shall have an immense surplus for export. The population of the United States will be rapidly increasing, and its farm production decreasing, comparatively. So that the time is not far away when the United States will need from 200 to 300 million bushels of wheat from us, or some other country; not to speak of other produce. Will it not be an advantage to have that market open to us free of the onerous duties which have just been indicated? In regard to the settlement and development and enrichment of the North West reciprocity will have a big influence. Reciprocity will add largely to the value of every acre in the Canadian West. The United States farmer, tempted by the more fertile soil of the Canadian West, if he were assured of the United States market, being opened to him, if he settled in Canada, would create such a demand for Canadian wheat land as would rapidly raise the price.

General Benefits.

Thus the settlement of the country would be facilitated and the production of our soil many times increased. In the past three years we have increased in population by immigration 275,000, and at that rate we shall increase it 2 1-2 million in ten years, with a corresponding increase in crop production. Then we can and will, if we are assured of a large and convenient market, increase our production of articles that are now produced far short of our capacity. Mr. James, Deputy Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, says the farmers of this province, if they put

themselves to it, can double the present output of their tarms.

If the farmers of Ontario do that they will need a new market, such as reciprocity will open. And if they have the new and larger market the increase of production is made possible and probable. The benefits of reciprocity will not be confined alone to better markets and better prices, if it will stimulate increased farm and dairy production. Take the City of Peterborough of 16,000 or 18,-000. If the surrounding country. composed of the best farming land in Ontario, were by more energetic farming methods, made to produce double what it does now and made to yield a couple of million dollars' worth more of produce, could such an increased production be made without touching and benefitting every bank, every merchant, every doctor, every lawyer, and every man in business in the city? And the farmers of Ontario can do it if they try-if they are encouraged by a prospect of a larger and more accessible and more profitable market. Last year Denmark, a little country that Ontario could put into its pocket, with about 2 1-2 millions of people, is an example of farming reduced to a fine art. In 1909. Denmark sent to the British market 34 million dozens of eggs; Canada sent to the same market 34 thousand. The same year Denmark sent to the same market a million and threequarters hundred-weights of butter. and Canada, 22 thousand hundredweights. Denmark, in 1909, supplied Great Britain with 1,809.745 hundred weights of bacon, while Canada only sent 443,386 hundred weights. In 1909, Denmark exported to all countries 2 million dollars worth of cream-and reciprocity gives us a 90million market for cream, with the duty of 5c. per gallon removed. What is to prevent Ontario from doing likewise? Only one thing-not doing it. If we have a larger market for the articles in which Denmark excels, we will be encouraged to double our output, and, in this way. put farming upon a higher plane. add to its profits and, through the prosperitor of the farmer, stimulate and strengthen every interest of the community. I have not time, on this occasion, to enter into the details of the advantages of reciprocity, but can only treat of them in a general way. But let anyone take the list of free articles of farm produce I have submitted to you, and he can readily see how the removal of duty benefits the farmer.

Special Benefits.

But I might, however, specify one or two things where the experience of our farmers has demonstrated the benefits of an unhampered market. Now asto barley. It is well known that when barley, (before the McKinley tariff of 1890 killed the trade) had cheap entry into the United States, farmers had great success in growing and selling barley in that market. Canada, especially Ontario, grows the best barley for malting purposes, on the continent, and it is in great demand by United States' brewers. In 17 years, from 1876 to 1892-seventeen years of low duty-the farmers of Canada sent to the United States 135 million bushels of barley and got in cash for it 90 million dollars. The next seventeen years the high duty on barley prevailed, and the 135 million dwindled to total of only seven millions of a value of o. . 3 million dollars. In the first perio i under a 15 cents a bushel duty, the average price was 67 cents. In the second period, when the duty was 30c. a bushel, the average price was 42c. If a duty of 15 cents a bushel resulted in a profitable trade in barley for the Canadian farmer-giving him a big market and good profits-

If a duty of 30c per bushel practically killed the barley industry—

Will not free barley, as proposed by reciprocity, restore a profitable market to the farmer and be a money-making proposition? There may be some present who remember the conditions about fifty years ago, when the old reciprocity treaty was in force. they don't remember, their fathers have told them that these were the big days for barley raisers, when farmers got big prices-from 80c. to \$1.00 -and even more, a bushel. And they also told them what a blow the abolition of the treaty was to the farmers. They told them how the price of wool dropped from 40c. to 15c. per pound; of lambs, from \$4.50 to \$2.50, how barlev, which sold from \$1.00 to \$1.20 and \$1.25 dropped to 40c. or 50c. And the prices of cattle and hogs were cut in half-and so on with all that the farmer sent to the United States' market under the reciprocity treaty of 1854-1866. If getting Ontario barley into the United States fifty years ago free of duty—was a good thing for the farmers—if a moderate rate of duty made barley growing and shipping profitable from '76 to '92—if 30c. a bushel duty between 1892 and 1911 killed the business—is it not reasonable to say that an entire removal of the duty on barley will be a distinct and big boon to the farmers of Ontario, who under reciprocity will command, the whole of the Eastern United States' market, and the Western States will give a new market to western barley. In the Canadian west barley grows to perfection, and is a sure crop, as it ripens early and escapes frost risk.

The 30 cents a bushel United States' duty that killed the Canadian barley

trade, is still in force.

The reciprocity agreement will, if adopted, remove that duty and restore one of the most profitable crops to a large and profitable market.

The Potatoes and Apples.

Then take another crop that can be grown to advantage in Ontario-potatoes. How could reciprocity affect their sale? During twelve years of high duties-the present duty is 25c. per bushel-Canada sent to the United States eleven million dollars' worth more potatoes than the United States sent to us. Crops on this continent are not all uniform. Sometimes when we have big crop, parts of the United States have short crops-then our neighbours come to us and that is our harvestprices advance. With the duty removed, is it not reasonable to assert that reciprocity in the case of potatoes, as in the case of barley, would be of immense advantage to the farmers, without injuring the manufacturer, the working man and the financier? In 1910 Canada exported a total of 1,920,000 bushels of potatoes valued at \$1,133,'000. Britain, which admits potatoes free, took \$260,000 worth, Cuba \$605,000, and the United States, \$345,-000. The potatoes sent to the United States had to overcome a duty of 25c. per bushel. With this duty re moved, would not the profit of shipping potatoes, the profit of growing them, and the inducement to grow them be creatly increased, to the benefit of the Canadian farmer? I have referred to the effect of reciprocity upon the fruit industry, especially small fruits. As to how it will affect the apple trade, which is every year growing in importance, let me give the testimony of a good Conservative of Simcoe County, Mr. D. Quinlan, of Barrie. says reciprocity will be a good thing for hogs and sheep, lambs and barley. As to apples, he says, Canadian appes are of better quality, and will command a ready market in the United States always and against United States' competition, if the duty of 25c. per bushel is removed. Reciprocity, will help the market gardeners and fruit growers. These industries in the past 25 years have increased their sales in the face of high duties to the amount of seventy million dollars. With the duty removed it is certain that there will be a great and profitable increase of trade in these lines. To show how high duty kills trade and destroys profit for the farmer, it might again be mentioned, that Canadian, and principally Ontario farmers, in 17 years of high duty, lost 90 millions of dollars on barley alone. It is impracticable to enter into all the details, but every true farmer knows the value of the United States' mar-

United States' Prices Higher.

We are told that the prices for farm produce is higher in Ontario than the United States. Every farmer who has his eyes open knows this is not the Mr. Kohler, M.P., for Haldimand. made a careful comparative study of United States and Canadian prices for several years for certain live stock. In the case of lambs, the Toronto market for the months of Octoher, November and December in 1904, averaged \$4.62 and the Buffalo market, \$6.25. In the same month for 1909, the average price of lambs in the Toronto market was \$6.05 and in Buffalo market, \$7.50. In the matter of butchers' cattle, taking the average prices for the same months in the re spective markets, the average price for 1904 in Toronto was \$4.50 and the Buffalo market average was \$5.70. In 1909 the average price of butcher's cattle in the Toronto market for the last three months of the year was \$4.62 and the average price in the Buffalo market, \$6.12. A similar difference in prices in favour of the Buffalo market applies to calves also. The same general difference prevails in the other years and other months of all the years. Mr. Kohler is a large dealer in cattle and knows whereof he speaks and most of you know from common knowledge, or what others have told you, that what he says is correct. To show how a high duty has affected the cattle trade, as it has affected the barley trade, Mr. Kohler tells of the slump in the cattle trade that followed the high duties of the Dingley tariff. In 1879, 32 years ago, Canada shipped to Buffalo for local consumption and distribution in the United States, 79,164 head of cattle, in 1898, 71,131 head, and in 1910, exports had fallen to 26,441 head. This trade, the removal of duty by reciprocity will restore, to the advantage of the farmer. In the matter of hay. Mr. Kohler made enquiries as to the contract prices at the stock yards in Toronto and Buffalo.

The average price in Toronto stock yards last year was \$13.61, and last year the average price of hay in Buffalo stock yards was \$18.00—a differ-

ence of over \$4.00.

Will not the removal of \$4.00 a ton duty on hay, which gives the Ontario farmer access to a \$4.00-a-ton better market, be an advantage worth getting? To illustrate the advantage under the agreement take what would be gained by the removal of duty on what an average farmer might have for sale each year. This would be—

8 two-year steers and heifers at \$6.00 to \$10.00 each.

- 10 lambs, saving the duty, at 75c. each.
- 5 sheep, saving the duty, at \$1.50 each.
- 30 hogs, saving the duty, at \$1.50 each.
- 300 lbs. turkeys, saving the duty, at 5c. a lb.
- 15. tons hay, saving the duty at \$4.00 per ton.
- 300 bushels barley at a greatly advanced price, besides higher prices for all dairy products.

Buffalo is selected for comparison with Toronto, because it is easily accessible to Ontario, and a great distributing centre for the Eastern United States. Figures carefully collected (Hansard), Feb. 23th, 1911, col. 4531, show the same advantage of Buffalo prices over Montreal in the matter of live stock. These differences may not prevail over all the two countries at one time but as a general rule prices for these and farm and orahard products generally are higher in the United States than in Canada.

This applies to farm products generally except the matter of eggs, of which the Canadian price has of late been higher. This, however, is a small matter, for it is not perhaps to the farmer's credit that Canada hardly produces enough eggs to supply the home demand.

We have been importing eggs to Canada that, with proper enterprise, is capable of producing millions of dozens for export.

There is no need of amplifying figures to show that a free United States' market would be a big boon to the farmer.

Every Farmer Knows.

Every farmer not blinded by political prejudice, knows in his own heart that as the reciprocity treaty of 1854 was a great advantage to the farmer, so will the reciporcity agreement of 1911 be a similar benefit. Under the old reciprocity treaty of 1854-56, there was a tremendous boom in agriculture in Canada. In spite of the financial depression of 1855 and, subsequently, the expansion of Canadian trade with the United States, was over 20 millions. 1855, after one year of the treaty. it had advanced to 42 millions. After five years of reciprocity the trade grew to 48 millions. After nine years of reciprocity the total trade 55 to millions. In 1866, when the treaty had come to an end, the total was 84 millions. This wonderful growth of trade, from 20 millions to 84 millions, during twelve years of reciprocity, is all the more wonderfud, when it is remembered that during that period the population of Canada was only 3 millions. Now, when Canada's population has increased nearly threefold, when her capacity of production and her need of market has increased in greater proportions-

When the United States market, owing to its great growth of population and lessening production affords a larger inlet for Canadian natural products — when all these things are considered, the present reciprocity agreement, almost identical in scope and conditions with that of 1854, can confidently be counted upon to repeat and better the story of wonderful growth of trade, in the twelve years of the old treaty.

General Benefits.

Reciprocity promises to be of advantage to every part of Canada. Free fish will give this industry a great stimulus. The advantages Cananadian fishermen will gain by the agreement are regarded as so greatly to their interests that the Gloucester, (Mass.) fishermen, when they heard that the agreement made Canadian fish free to the United States market, hung the flags of their fishing smacks at half-mast, as a token of the mourning over the competition of free fish from Canada. Columbia fishermen will gain similar advantages to the Maritime provinces. And all over Canada every industry dealing with our natural resources, will be benefited. I have remarked that the opposition to re-ciprocity does not come from the thinking and unprejudiced farmer. This applies to the Canadian farmer. for the farmers of the United States think that Canada has secured the big end of the bargain in the agreement and that Canadian competition will be ruinous. And United States farmers are doing all in their power to defeat the ratification of a reciprocity agreement that will give what they consider such great and undue advantages to the Canadian farmer.

General Results.

The pending reciprocity agreement seems to me, when viewed dispassionately, to be in the interests of Canada, especially the farmers of Canada. It may, as every fiscal change is bound to do, pinch some interest a little bere and there. But taken in the large, considered in its broad aspects, it is bound to be a distinct national advantage.

It will benefit the farming community by opening a new, larger, and most convenient market for every product of the soil. While I enefit*ing the pivotal industry of Canada—the farming industry—it will not injure any other, for, except in a very few cases, it does not affect manufactured products. It promises a vastly augmented flow of the life blood of antion, trade, through new and wider markets. We are doing everything in our power to extend our trade. We have spent hundreds of millions in providing transportation, in the interests of trade, and are spending millions more. We are spending large sums in subsidizing steamship

lines to extend our trade. We are maintaining trade agents in foreign countries. We need, and are seeking. new markets, in all directions. In view of these things, in view of all we are doing, and shall continue to do, to broaden our trade, is it not wise to accept the opportunity of dropping into a new market of 92 millions at our very doors? Not by large expenditures in transportation—not by heavy subsidy of steamshiplines, but simply by sponging out a few duties in a tariff teat—by simply removing the barriers to trade intercourse.

The Long-Sought Way.

The present reciprocity agreement should be accepted as the culmination of the steady and persistent efforts of both great political parties. which have made reciprocity their goal for fifty years. Now, when we have an opportunity of gaining what we long have sought, shall we not accept it? Mr. Borden, present leader of the Conservative party, is now speaking in the North West. He repudiates the policy of his party since Confederation, in repudiating reciprocity. He repudiates the policy of the great Conservative leaders of the past, almost as clever and farseeing statesman as himself — Sir John Macdonald, Sir James Thomp-son, Sir Charles Tupper. In taking this stand Mr. Borden takes ground agaist these great men, and against the best elements of the Conservative party of the present day-against the farmers of Canada, Conservatives and Liberals alike. He sets himself against the only measure of tariff read, that has been proposed in the farmers' interests since Confederation. The farmers of Canada, in the matter of tariff legislation, have long been neglected. They have patiently borne the burden, which the necessary tarriff to establish our manufacturing industries upon a sound foot-

ing, has imposed. Now, the farmers' time for consideration has come, and they mean to have it; and should have it, especially when giving them an unobstructed market, can be done with no disadvantage to the manufacturing industry, which will, instead, benefit from the increased prosperity of the farmer, which will flow from the enlarged market opportunities opened to them by the reciprocity agreement of 1911.

At the close of Mr. Stratton's address, Mr. Geo. N. Gordon, referred to the interest the audience had taken in the interesting address, which must have involved a good deal of time in arranging the valuable data it presented. He had no conception, till he had heard the matter referred to, as Mr. Stratton had done, of the great extent of public improvements made in West Peterborough in the last two years. He did not think that the coustituency, so far as representation was concerned, could be in any better hands than it was at present. So far as the reciprocity agreement was concerned, he was fully convinced that the working man and the farmer could, for once, go hand in hand for The farmer their mutual advantage. produced the wealth of the country. This wealth, when marketed, brought back to the country money to be invested in manufacturing enterprises, that give the mechanic and working men their weekly wages; and the working man knew-felt it in his pocket-when the crops were bad, when the price was kept down; because the manufacturer had to curtail operations and this. in turn, affected the working men. The working men were appreciating this, and he had no doubt that those in Peterborough would support the agreement, for the benefit of all.

After a vote of thanks to the chairman and cheers for the King, the meeting concluded.



